

REMARKS

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 10 and 13 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Owen et al. (US 4,789,528) in view of Kao et al. (US 5,266,281).

As set forth in the previous response, the Owen reference is directed to a technique for sequential rotation of reactors in a multi-reactor catalytic conversion system. As set forth in the Summary of the Invention section, Owen is directed to a system for sequentially rotating the system of three or more reactors to allow the most fresh, or newly generated, catalyst to be in the last process flow position and the least active, or most used catalyst to be in the first position, with one reactor in the regeneration mode. Thus, Owen describes a process in which one of the reactors is in the regeneration mode and the other reactors are operated in series with the reactor having the oldest catalyst being in the first position and the reactor with the newest catalyst being in the last position.

Independent claim 1 of the present application is directed to a reactor system comprising two or more single unit operated reactors that are fed by a common feed line and have product removed through a common product discharge line. Accordingly, this system is designed such that the reactors are operated in parallel, not in series as is the Owen system.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 would not have been obvious in view of Owen and Kao. Kao provides no teaching to overcome the shortcomings in the disclosure of the Owen et al. reference.

Inasmuch as claims 2, 5, 6, 10 and 13 all depend from claim 1, Applicant submits that they are patentable for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

In the Office Action, claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Owen in view of Kao and Cachera et al. (US 3,968,653). Applicant submits that claim 12 would not have been obvious over the cited references for the same reason discussed above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kao in view of Owen. Independent claim 9 is directed to a process for the preparation of hydrocarbons wherein the process is performed in the reactor system comprising two or more single unit operated reactors which have a common reactant feed line and a common product discharge line. As

discussed above, these reactors are operated in parallel, not in series as is the Owen process. Accordingly, applicant submits that claim 9 would not have been obvious for the reasons discussed above.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kao in view of Owen and Haag et al. (US 4,279,830). Inasmuch as claim 14 depends from claim 9, Applicant submits that it would not have been obvious for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 9.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that none of the claims would have been obvious in view of the cited references. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the case is requested. Should the Examiner find any impediment to the prompt allowance of the case which could be corrected by telephone interview with the undersigned, the Examiner is requested to initiate such an interview.

Respectfully submitted,

HANS GEORG LEFFER

P. O. Box 2463
Houston, Texas 77252-2463

By /Craig M. Lundell/
Attorney, Craig M. Lundell
Registration No. 30,284
(713) 241-2475